UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/590,876	07/10/2007	Hartmut Schumacher	10191/4350	3753	
26646 KENYON & K	7590 02/23/201 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER			
ONE BROADV	VAY	RUTLAND WALLIS, MICHAEL			
NEW YORK, N	NY 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2836		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/23/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments have been entered; hence the previously identified drawing objections have been withdrawn

Applicant's arguments filed 2/15/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first argues the element cited in Heckel is not a voltage regulator because the element is not disclosed to receive a varying voltage input and output a constant regulated output.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., receive a varying voltage input and output a constant regulated output) are not recited in the rejected claims, nor is it found, a reading of presently presented claim inherently requires the limitations argued by Applicant. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant secondly argues Heckel is not connected to the energy reserve capacitor and is instead connected to the connection unit, current sources, and microprocessor and ignition capacitor.

In response, the presently presented claims do not require a direct connection, if Applicant intends a direct connection Applicant may amend the claims to require a

Art Unit: 2836

direct connection. The element 3 is clearly connected to the capacitor Cs via the conducting of item 5.

Applicant lastly argues the limitation the voltage regulator sets a voltage is not found in the cited art because the Heckel does not teach the voltage regulator outputs a constant voltage.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., output a constant regulated output) are not recited in the rejected claims, nor is it found, a reading of presently presented claim inherently requires the limitations argued by Applicant. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In view of the above the rejection is deemed proper and therefore had been maintained.

/Michael Rutland-Wallis/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2836

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/590,876	SCHUMACHER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MICHAEL RUTLAND WALLIS	2836	

	MICHAEL RUTLAND WALLIS	2836	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 February 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS.	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWC
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two month:	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to  (a) They raise new issues that would require further core  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present o</li></ul>			Te issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	serresperialing framiser of infanty reje	otoa olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·		_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 7-11 and 13.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	t bafava ay ay tha data of filing a Nia	tine of Americal will and	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.  Other:			
	/Michael Rutland-Wallis	1	
	Primary Examiner Art U		